

Categorical Exclusion Not Established by Statute
CX Number: WY-D030-2016-0097-CX

A. BACKGROUND

BLM Office: Rawlins Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: 6633

Proposed Action Title/Type: Herpetofauna Inventory and Monitoring

Location of Proposed Action: Various Rawlins Field Office Locations

Description of the Proposed Action:

Project Design: The proposed project would utilize drift fences (usually Y-shaped) with pitfall traps and funnel traps (See Appendix B). Cover objects would likely be associated with each fence, as well. The drift fences would be constructed using aluminum flashing cut in either 5 or 10-meter lengths. The bottom edge of the flashing would be buried in the ground approximately 4 inches deep to create a barrier for reptiles and amphibians moving through the trap site. The drift fences would be less than 24 inches in height. Pitfall traps, consisting of containers the size of a 5-gallon bucket or smaller, would be buried in the ground to the lip of the container. Funnel traps would be constructed from plastic storage totes. Covers would be constructed from plywood, sheet metal, tarpaper, or a combination of these materials. Tarpaper would only be used in concurrence with wood to prevent it from being blown away or destroyed by the wind.

Trapping would take place during the active season (typically May-October) for reptiles and amphibians. Upon completion of the project, all materials would be removed from the trapping locations except the center T-post. The center T-post would be left as a marker, so that the exact same locations can be used over the course of multiple years for monitoring efforts. Soil from the pitfall traps and funnel traps would be retained near the fences so that the holes could be filled back in when the traps are removed. No reseeding is planned for the trap sites; however, they would be monitored for invasive species after the project is completed. The fences would be completely terrestrial and would not impede the flow of water. No trapping would be conducted on well pads, roadways, pipelines, etc. No trapping would be conducted within wild horse Herd Management Areas. Temporary fence enclosures would be constructed around the traps to keep livestock away from the drift fences and traps.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

Land Use Plan Name: Record of Decision and Approved Rawlins Resource Management Plan
Date Approved/Amended: December 24, 2008/September 21, 2015

_____The proposed action is in conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP), because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

 X The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP decision(s) even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Section 2.3.18 Wildlife and Fisheries
p. 2-52: Management Goals #1

Manage for the biological integrity and habitat function of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems to sustain and optimize distribution and abundance of all native, desirable non-native, and Special Status fish and wildlife species.

p. 2-52: Management Objectives #3

Maintain, restore, or enhance designated BLM State Sensitive Species habitat to prevent listing under the ESA, in coordination and consultation with other local, state, and federal agencies and consistent with other agency plans, policies, and agreements.

C: COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 43 CFR 46.210:

“1.6 Nondestructive data collection, inventory (including field, aerial, and satellite surveying and mapping), study, research, and monitoring activities.”

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 apply. These circumstances, and the rationale specific to this categorical exclusion, are listed and described in Table 1.

I considered the proposed Herpetofauna Inventory and Monitoring project and the project design features in my evaluation, and find that the Proposed Action would not have any effects that may significantly affect the environment.

D: AUTHORIZED OFFICER SIGNATURE


Dennis J. Carpenter
Field Manager

JUN 16 2016
Date

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact: Tony Bridger, Wildlife Biologist, Rawlins Field Office, PO Box 2407, Rawlins, WY 82301, or you may call (307) 328-4291.

Table 1. Extraordinary Circumstances

	Extraordinary Circumstances	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
(a)	Have significant impacts on public health or safety.	No	The proposed project would not affect public health or safety.
(b)	Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	No	Site-specific surveys would be conducted as monitoring sites are selected to detect potentially significant cultural/historical sites. If any are found or documented, they would be avoided (See attached Cultural Resources Clearance.).
(c)	Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (National Environmental Policy Act Section 102(2)(E)).	No	Does not indicate any controversial environmental effects from the installation of herpetofauna monitoring traps.
(d)	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No	No significant environmental effects or unknown risks have been identified.
(e)	Establish precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration with significant environmental effects.	No	Surveys and monitoring are conducted on many resources. No new precedent would be set by this project.
(f)	Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No	The Proposed Action, when considered with other actions in the area, would not have cumulatively significant environmental effects to BLM lands and/or resources.
(g)	Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.	No	No properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau, would be affected by the inventory collection methods.
(h)	Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical habitat for these species.	No	Survey was conducted to detect potentially significant impacts to species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or designated Critical habitat for these species. No species were found or documented (see attached Request for Wildlife/Fisheries/Rare Plants Review, Determination of RMP Conformance, Need for ESA Section 7 Consultation, and Biological Evaluation for Other Species).
(i)	Violate a Federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No	The Proposed Action would not violate a Federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or a requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.
(j)	Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No	The Proposed Action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.
(k)	Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	No	The proposed project would not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites.

	Extraordinary Circumstances	Affected Yes/No	Rationale
(I)	Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	No	As proposed, the project design features would ensure that this project would not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species.

APPENDIX A

Special Terms & Conditions

The following Terms and Conditions are in addition to those incorporated in the Proposed Action and Applicant Committed Environmental Protection Measures.

1. Specific locations for all traps will be given to archeology prior to any construction or trapping activity. Drift fences will not be constructed until after archeology has surveyed the locations.
2. Specific locations for all traps will be given to forestry prior to any construction or trapping activity. Drift fences will not be constructed in areas where prescribed burns are planned.
3. Specific locations for traps will be given to wildlife prior to any construction of trapping activity to mitigate any wildlife issues.

APPENDIX B
Drift Fence Diagram

